

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11 and 14-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-9 and 11 are amended, claims 10, 12 and 13 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, and claims 14-22 are added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 8, 9 and 11 contain allowable subject matter. For at least the reasons discussed below, Applicants submit that all pending claims are allowable.

The drawings are objected to for allegedly not including reference numeral "71". Applicants respectfully submit that the open-loop control portion recited in paragraph [0068] is shown in FIG. 6 above the feedback control portion 72. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that no drawing corrections are necessary. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,748,206 to Yamane. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Yamane fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in amended independent claim 1 including, *inter alia*, a control device that controls operation of the carriage using a first set of the plurality of sets of parameters and detects a first behavior of the carriage in a constant speed area, after controlling the operation of the carriage using the first set of the plurality of sets of parameters, the control device controls operation of the carriage using a second set of the plurality of sets of parameters and detects a second behavior of the carriage in the constant speed area, and after controlling the operation of the carriage using at least the first set and the

second set of the plurality of sets of parameters, the control device selects one of the plurality of sets of parameters based on the detected first behavior and the detected second behavior.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Yamane fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 1 as well as all the features recited in claims 3, 4 and 5, which depend from claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yamane in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0172510 to Kobayashi et al. (Kobayashi '510). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Yamane fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Kobayashi '510 fails to overcome the deficiencies of Yamane, as applied to claim 1, from which claim 2 depends. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Yamane and Kobayashi '510 fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 2. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yamane in view of U.S. Patent 5,317,668 to Kobayashi (Kobayashi '668). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Yamane fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Kobayashi '668 fails to overcome the deficiencies of Yamane, as applied to claim 1, from which claim 6 depends. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Yamane and Kobayashi '668 fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 6. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamane in view of U.S. patent No. 6,411,008 to Otsubo et al. (Otsubo). The rejection of claim 10 is rendered moot by the cancellation of claim 10.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamane in view of Otsubo and further in view of Kobayashi '668. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 12 and 13.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamane in view of Otsubo. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Yamane fails to disclose or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Otsubo fails to overcome the deficiencies of Yamane, as applied to claim 1, from which claim 7 depends. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of Yamane and Otsubo fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 7. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

New claims 15-22 are patentable over Yamane, Otsubo, Kobayahi '668 and Kobayashi '510 because the references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 15 and 20.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi
Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/hs

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: August 4, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--